

Finally, let me offer some observations as a member of the Armed Services Committee. Implications of a war against Iraq will reverberate at every level of the Department of Defense. Problematic issues the military faces today—global international commitments, increased personnel tempo, and over-reliance on the Reserves and National Guard—will only be exacerbated when military requirements for Iraq are thrown in the mix.

Of foremost concern is the inevitable enormous strain on military manpower. Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld testified before the Armed Services Committee that no increase in troop end strength is necessary to carry out an invasion and peacekeeping activities in Iraq. No one else whom our Committee spoke to held this opinion. In fact, retired flag officers and distinguished military analysts all agreed that increased end strength was imperative for the ultimate success of our reconstruction of Iraq.

And the personnel problem extends far beyond the full time, active duty forces. Since the Persian Gulf war, our reliance on the Reserves and National Guard has grown to the point where it would be impossible for DoD to meet its worldwide commitments without the presence of these units. Reservists and Guardsmen no longer talk about the rare mobilization in support of a national emergency; rather, some units routinely deploy overseas alongside their active duty counterparts. How long can we continue to call upon these volunteers to shoulder more than their fair share? How long can we ask civilian employers and families of our Guard and Reserve to carry on without them? I sincerely hope that one of the first orders of business in the 108th Congress is a comprehensive overhaul of our military personnel system in order to ease the stress on our citizen soldiers. Otherwise, our Reservists and Guardsmen are sure to vote with their feet.

These considerations do not exhaust the questions raised by the prospect of an attack on Iraq. Serious as they are, the most serious questions of all are the ones none of us can anticipate. War has a way of creating new dynamics and unleashing new forces in the world. All too frequently, those consequences are inimical to the interests of established powers. Those who see the dawn of a new era of peace, stability and democracy in the Middle East as a result of a strike against Iraq would do well to think again.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution.

The threat from Iraq is very real and increasingly dangerous. Saddam Hussein's belligerent intentions and his possession and ongoing development of weapons of mass destruction to fulfill those intentions make him a clear and present danger to the United States and the world.

Particularly worrisome is the evidence of Iraq's UAV capability. Iraq's ability to use unmanned aerial vehicles to deliver biological and chemical weapons far outside its national borders represents a qualitative increase in the danger it poses.

History demonstrates Saddam Hussein's willingness to use such weapons against unarmed civilians, including his own people. And it demonstrates his unhesitating instincts to invade his neighbors—Iran and Kuwait—and to attack Israel.

That he appears, to quote Director Tenet's recent letter, to be "drawing a line short of

conducting terrorist attacks" does not persuade me that he won't.

He is impulsive, irrational, vicious, and cruel. Unchecked, he will only grow stronger as he develops capability to match his disdain for America and his Middle East neighbors.

History shows that had Israel not destroyed Iraq's nuclear reactor in 1981, Saddam Hussein would now have nuclear capability. But he did not cease his nuclear ambitions. Had coalition military forces not swept through Iraq in 1991, he would have possessed nuclear weapons by 1993.

The CIA now reports that Iraq is one year away from a functional nuclear device once it acquires missile material. Waiting one hour, one day, one month in such an environment, as some suggest, is too risky.

We have to act now because the U.N. resolutions following the gulf war have not contained the Iraqi threat.

With the passage of time, international resolve to enforce United Nations resolutions has weakened.

This resolution will demonstrate to the U.N. American resolve to act if necessary, but preferably in a peaceful and multilateral way.

The strong and forceful language in this resolution will help Secretary Powell persuade his counterparts at the U.N. and around the globe to join us.

The resolution we are considering is greatly improved from the draft the Administration proposed and I commend Leader GEPHARDT for negotiating these improvements.

This resolution narrows the scope of action to the threats to national security posed by Iraq and enforcing compliance with U.N. Resolutions.

This resolution stresses a strong preference for peaceful and diplomatic action, authorizing the use of force only if all peaceful options have failed.

This resolution requires the President to comply with the War Powers Act and report regularly to Congress should military action become necessary, as well as after the use of force is completed.

This resolution addresses post-disarmament Iraq and the role of the United States and international community in rebuilding.

And of crucial importance, this resolution requires the President to certify to Congress that action in Iraq will not dilute our ability to wage the war on terrorism.

Removing WMD from Iraq is an important priority, but it cannot replace our counterterrorism efforts at home and abroad. We must ensure that we do not divert attention from protecting our homeland—beginning with the creation of a Department of Homeland Security.

We must also strengthen and expand programs and policies aimed at stopping the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and their components. The ready availability of material for chemical, biological and nuclear weapons, and the know-how to make them, has allowed Iraq to rebuild rapidly since 1991 and the expulsion of inspectors in 1998. But nonproliferation programs have been underfunded at a time when they need to be expanded.

If we don't stop the flow of scientists and materials for weapons of mass destruction, we will soon be faced with another Iraq. The axis of evil will grow to include more states. We will encounter the nightmare scenario of nuclear-

armed terrorist groups, capable of blackmailing or attacking our cities and citizens from within, with little hope of deterrence or diplomacy to stop them.

Sentiment in my district is high—both in favor and opposition to this resolution. I thank my constituents for sharing their views with me. I have listened carefully, learned as much as I could, and now it is time to lead.

Like all my colleagues, I fervently hope that the U.S. will not need to use force. But the best chance to avoid military action is to show the U.N. and Iraq that we will not flinch from it.

Giving diplomatic efforts every chance is the right policy and this resolution gives diplomacy its maximum chance to succeed.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, September 11, 2001, brought to light a horror that the American people and the world had up until then only seen in movies. On that day, we learned, as a nation, what it means to be terrorized. The nineteen men who hijacked airliners and used them as guided missiles showed us that even on our home soil Americans are not shielded from the reach of terrorism. Bearing in mind, we must continue to defend against these forces of evil and those who support them. We cannot spend the rest of our lives in fear. I support this resolution in order to protect the life of every American, at home and abroad, I also believe it offers the best chance for peace because it clearly communicates U.S. resolve to Saddam Hussein and makes clear that his continued refusal to disarm will be his undoing.

Mr. Speaker, granting the authority to send our brave men and women in uniform overseas to fight in hostile territory is the most difficult decision we make in Congress. That was true last year and it remains true today. Since the beginning of the first mission in Afghanistan on October 7, 2001, our military men and women have fought terrorists and disrupted their networks, liberated a country, and brought the prospect of peace and democracy to a nation that had not seen either in decades. While our military campaign in Afghanistan is slowly coming to a close, we must not lose sight of our primary objective, to rid the world of terrorists and those who sustain them. Saddam Hussein and his regime in Iraq fit this description.

Mr. Speaker, after sifting through the evidence, reviewing the facts, and probing the Administration, I am convinced Saddam Hussein's regime is a clear and present threat to the security of the United States and our allies. Since he came to power in Iraq in 1979, Hussein has waged war on his neighbors and terrorized his own people with chemical weapons. He has allowed terrorists groups, such as al Qaeda, to operate safely in Iraq. He has supported terrorist actions by compensating the families of Palestinian suicide bombers for their attacks on innocent Israeli citizens. He orders his military to fire missiles and artillery on U.S. and a coalition aircraft that patrol the U.N.-imposed no-fly zones that protect Kurd and Shi'a Muslims in Northern and Southern Iraq, respectively. He has attempted to assassinate a former U.S. President. Moreover, he has violated the basic human rights of his people, causing them to live in fear and poverty, while he builds Presidential palaces and lives of life of luxury. Currently, there is nothing stopping him from using weapons of mass destruction against the United States and our allies, or from giving them to terrorists.